~~40-125.R~~
40/602

patent 883,973 is void for lack of invention in view of the prior art. (Cls. 7,8 and 10 involved.)

2. The Hughes patent 962,220, held void for lack of invention in view of the prior art. (Cls. 5 and 6 involved.)

"There would apparently be no more invention in attaching to an automobile body, a bracket having an arm for carrying a number sign, than there would be in attaching a bracket to a tree or post in front of a hotel or store, having an arm to which was attached a swinging sign-board; nor would the problem of illuminating such sign involve invention since its solution would merely require the attachment of another standard for carrying a lamp sufficiently in advance of the sign to illumine its face. It is hard to understand why a problem of that character should have proved knotty, if it did, in the first instance; but however that may have been, all difficulty was resolved, when Rosenbluth undertook its solution by the teachings of the prior art which showed similar devices of various kinds. For instance, a bracket attached to a bed, one arm of which carried a table and the other a lamp which illuminated the table; and another, also a bracket having two arms, one of which carried a book-rack and the other a lamp which illuminated it. The art also showed various other devices whereby different articles, including sign-boards and numbers, were illuminated by lamps affixed to adjustable brackets. - - - - - - - - - as above stated, the idea embodied in the patent under consideration, taken by itself, is of the simplest character and of questionable patentability, but when in addition to that fact the prior art, in analogous matters, is considered, it becomes manifest that the attempt further to dilute this simple idea and then to protect it by means of a patent, should not be fostered. R., giving him the utmost credit to which he is entitled, merely took what was simple and old and commonplace in analogous arts, and applied it to a new use. Everything that he did had already been done in substantially the same way, although the device had not been applied to an automobile."

"The patent to Hughes shows no patentable advance upon R.- - - - -The only advance, if it be advance, called for by those claims (5 and 6) over those of R.- - - lies in the fact that the horizontal socket therein referred to is provided at the end adjacent to the lamp support with a stop. The usefulness of this stop is not clearly apparent but granting it that quality, its insertion did not involve invention. Stops of so many varieties are in such common use in mechanics that, once the propriety or necessity of having one in any given piece of mechanism were established, any person skilled in the art could readily introduce it and its introduction would not constitute an inventive act."

- - - - 0 - - - - -

G. CO. v. COX BRASS MFG. CO. (221 F.R. 930.)

3,973(claims 7, 8 and 1

, 252,908; Lemon,325,84 ...l;

61; Spillinger,321,546;

...ces described in the ea... ...d for

...ficient purposes, is immaterial. Al... ...patentee seems to

by a combination of a lam
omobile accessory, still
ation required the exerci.
the use to which lamps and
y been put in illuminating signs
er placed in close proximity thereto."